UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,345	10/11/2005		14219-074US1/P2002,0642	5755
26161 FISH & RICHA	7590 12/11/200 ARDSON PC		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1022			KEMMERLE III, RUSSELL J	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/11/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/523,345	ALTHOFF ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	RUSSELL J. KEMMERLE III	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>20 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejectio FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.194. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	. ,,	mpliant Amandment (OTOL 224)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpilant Amendinent (r	-10L-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5 and 7-13</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Steven P. Griffin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claims as currently amended recite combinations of claim limitations that had not previously been presented, and would therefore require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argument that an example has been provided in the remarks is not found to be persuasive to withdraw the rejection under 35 USC 112 1st paragraph. Applicants have stated the position "that one of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to increase and/or decrease the relative permittivity of the dielectric by adding chemicals in the appropriate amounts to produce the K20 material." However this position continues to fail to provide any evidence of support or even an example of what type of material this would be. An example of what a dielectric material may include is not the same as showing evidence that one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention by Applicants, would have been able to create a K20 material that could be used as recited in the current claims.

Despite Applicants continued objections to both the rejection under 35 USC 112 first paragraph and 103 being put in the same Office action, they are not considered to be contradictory. The two positions should not be taken together as suggested by Applicants, but instead each stand on their own, and are completely unrelated to the other.

Applicants additionally argue that the purpose of the temperature change of Tamhankar's firing cycle is different than that of the current invention. However, this ignores that the rejection is based on the combined firing cycles of Tamhankar in combination with Herron and Harada. The rejection can not be overcome by arguing against a single reference on its own.